



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/024,109	12/17/2001	William Scott	56135575-35	3132

26453 7590 02/25/2005

BAKER & MCKENZIE
805 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER

O'CONNOR, GERALD J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3627

DATE MAILED: 02/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/024,109

Applicant(s)

Scott et al.

Examiner

O'Connor

Art Unit

3627

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE THREE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) none is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on December 17, 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>20021126</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

(e)¹ the invention was described in-

(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designating the United States was published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or

(2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a).

2. Claims 1-11 and 13-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by von Rosen et al. (US 6,493,677).

Von Rosen et al. disclose a method of designing and ordering equipment for manufacture on-line, comprising: presenting a list of equipments to select for design on-line from a remote

¹ The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as amended by the AIPA (post-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

location over a computer network; requesting design specification information for a selected equipment from the list of equipments; automatically generating a drawing of the selected equipment based on the design specification information; updating a manufacturing database with the design specification information needed for manufacturing the equipment; sending the drawings to a customer for approval.

Regarding claim 2, the method of von Rosen et al. includes validating the customer permission before the presenting.

Regarding claim 3, the sending of the method of von Rosen et al. includes electronically mailing the drawings to the customer over the computer network.

Regarding claim 4, the method of von Rosen et al. includes that the computer network is the World Wide Web.

Regarding claim 5, the method of von Rosen et al. includes allowing the customer to initiate a purchase order for the equipment according to the design specification.

Regarding claim 6, the method of von Rosen et al. includes allowing the customer to receive the design specification at a later session.

Regarding claim 7, the method of von Rosen et al. includes allowing the customer to continue configuring equipment for order from a previous session.

Regarding claim 8, the generating a drawing of the method of von Rosen et al. includes generating separate drawings of parts comprising the equipment required for manufacturing the equipment.

Regarding claim 9, the generating a drawing of the method of von Rosen et al. further includes determining parts required for assembling the equipment.

Regarding claim 10, the generating a drawing of the method of von Rosen et al. includes computing parts information required for assembling the equipment.

Regarding claim 11, the updating of the method of von Rosen et al. includes updating all parts information required for assembling the equipment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claim 12 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over von Rosen et al. (US 6,493,677).

Von Rosen et al. disclose a method of designing and ordering equipment for manufacture on-line, as applied above in the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), but the method of von Rosen et al. does not explicitly include generating a bar code to identify the drawing and printing the bar code on the drawing. However, generating a bar code to identify a drawing and printing the bar code on the drawing is certainly a well known, hence obvious, step to follow to those of ordinary skill in the art, given the ubiquitous nature of bar codes and bar code readers.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of the invention, to have modified the method of von Rosen et al. so as to generate a bar code to identify the drawing and print the bar code on the drawing, as is well known to do, in order to improve efficiency and reduce errors by allowing the bar code to be scanned by a computer bar code reader, rather than identification information having to be entered manually via a keyboard, and since so doing could be performed readily and easily by any person of ordinary skill in the art, with neither undue experimentation, nor risk of unexpected results.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to the disclosure.
6. Any inquiry concerning this communication, or earlier communications, should be directed to the examiner, **Jerry O'Connor**, whose telephone number is **(703) 305-1525**, and whose facsimile number is **(703) 746-3976**.

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that on April 14, 2005 the examiner's telephone and facsimile numbers will be changing, to (571) 272-6787 and (571) 273-6787, respectively.

The examiner can normally be reached weekdays from 9:30 to 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Robert Olszewski, can be reached at (703) 308-5183, or, beginning April 14, 2005, at (571) 272-6788.

Official replies to this Office action may be submitted by any *one* of fax, mail, or hand delivery. **Faxed replies are preferred and should be directed to (703) 872-9306 (not changing).**

Application: 10/024,109

Paper No. 20050217

Art Unit: 3627

Page 6

Mailed replies should be addressed to "Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450." Hand delivered replies should be delivered to the "Customer Service Window, Randolph Building, 401 Dulany Street, Alexandria, VA 22314."

GJOC

February 17, 2005

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gerald J. O'Connor", followed by the date "(2-17-05)" in parentheses.

Gerald J. O'Connor

Patent Examiner

Group Art Unit 3627